

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 2, 5-22, and 25-33 are pending, with claims 1, 25, and 32 being independent. Claim 25 has been amended to even more clearly recite and distinctly claim the present invention. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification, including, for example, at page 5, lines 23-25 and page 9, lines 17-27.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 5-18, 21, 25-27, 30, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,877,257 (“Cain”) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0173556 (“Moore”). Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection; therefore, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Cain relates to a process for the purification of hydrocarbon solutions of oxygenated organic compounds comprising acids and which also may contain dissolved or occluded metal contaminants such as iron or iron compounds. (Column 1, Lines 15-19). Cain discloses that the contaminated hydrocarbon organic chemical mixture can be the product produced by synthesis when carbon monoxide and hydrogen are reacted with a promoted iron catalyst. (Col. 1, Lines 26-36). Cain discloses that the product produced from such a process contains dissolved or occluded metal contaminants such as iron or iron compounds. (Col. 1, lines 51-54). With regard to the purification process, Cain discloses that a crude hydrocarbon synthesis oil is washed with an aqueous acid solution and this washing step is repeated until no brown precipitate is produced on the addition of a suitable base to the acid extract. (Figure 2 and Column 2, Lines 19-25). Cain further discloses that the oil treated in this manner is then neutralized in a neutralization vessel with an aqueous caustic solution to produce an upper neutral oil layer containing dissolved chemicals. (Figure 2 and Column 2, Lines 36-38). Cain discloses that from the bottom of the neutralization vessel, a rich aqueous soap solution, free of iron and basic nitrogen compounds, is withdrawn. (Column 7, Lines 40-60 and Figure 2).

Moore is directed to a method for preparing liquid fuel in a hydrocarbon synthesis process, and more specifically for preparing a stabilized mixed fuel from a carbon source at a

remote site, and tailoring one or more finished fuel products from the mixed fuel in order to meet local fuel requirements at a market site. (Page 1, Paragraph [0001]). Moore discloses mildly hydrotreating a stabilized product mixture at a market site to remove contaminants accumulated in the product during transportation. (Page 3, Paragraphs [0037] and [0054]).

Independent claim 1 recites a method of removing contamination from a Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream, the method comprising: conducting a Fischer-Tropsch process using a catalyst comprising cobalt to produce a Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream; passing the Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream to a treatment zone; passing an aqueous acidic stream to the treatment zone; contacting the Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream with the aqueous acidic stream in the treatment zone to form a mixed stream; separating the mixed stream into at least one acidic extracted Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream, and at least one modified aqueous acidic stream; passing the at least one acidic extracted Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream to a hydroprocessing reactor containing catalyst beds; and hydroprocessing the acidic extracted Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream to provide a hydroprocessed product stream, wherein the contacting step removes Al contamination from the Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream and substantially reduces plugging of catalyst beds in the hydroprocessing reactor.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

MPEP § 2143.

Applicants respectfully submit that there is no suggestion or motivation, either in Cain or Moore, or in the knowledge generally available to one or ordinary skill in the art, to combine Cain and Moore. As provided above, Cain relates to a process for the purification of hydrocarbon solutions of oxygenated organic compounds comprising acids. In contrast, Moore relates to a method for preparing a stabilized mixed fuel from a carbon source at a remote site, and tailoring one or more finished fuel products from the mixed fuel in order to meet local fuel requirements at a market site. Applicants respectfully submit that the process of purification of Cain is quite distinct from the method of Moore involving a remote site and a market site. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no suggestion or

motivation to combine any feature of the method of Moore with the process of Cain. Applicants respectfully submit that one of skill in the art would not merely combine process features of Moore with Cain. Applicants further respectfully submit that there is no reasonable expectation of success in combining Cain and Moore, and without an expectation of success in combining features of Moore with Cain, such a combination is improper and results in impermissible hindsight.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that even if there were some suggestion or motivation to combine Cain and Moore and a reasonable expectation of success, Cain and Moore, even when combined, do not disclose or suggest all the claim limitations of independent claim 1 or claims dependent thereon. As described above, Cain discloses that a crude hydrocarbon synthesis oil is washed with an aqueous acid solution and this washing step is repeated until no brown precipitate is produced on the addition of a suitable base to the acid extract. Cain discloses that the oil treated in this manner is then *neutralized* in a neutralization vessel with an aqueous caustic solution.

Accordingly, even if combined, Cain and Moore do not disclose or suggest a method of removing contamination from a Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream comprising: conducting a Fischer-Tropsch process using a catalyst comprising cobalt to produce a Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream; passing the Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream to a treatment zone; passing an aqueous acidic stream to the treatment zone; contacting the Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream with the aqueous acidic stream in the treatment zone to form a mixed stream; separating the mixed stream into at least one acidic extracted Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream, and at least one modified aqueous acidic stream; passing the at least one acidic extracted Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream to a hydroprocessing reactor containing catalyst beds; and hydroprocessing the acidic extracted Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream to provide a hydroprocessed product stream, wherein the contacting step removes Al contamination from the Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream and substantially reduces plugging of catalyst beds in the hydroprocessing reactor.

Therefore, for at least the above-noted reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-18, and 21 over Cain in view of Moore be withdrawn.

With regard to independent claim 25, this claim recites a method of removing contamination from a Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream. The method comprises conducting a Fischer-Tropsch process using a catalyst comprising cobalt to produce a Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream; passing the Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream to a treatment zone; passing an aqueous acidic stream to the treatment zone; extracting Al contamination from the Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream by contacting the Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream with the aqueous acidic stream in the treatment zone at extraction conditions to form a mixed stream comprising at least one acidic extracted Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream, a modified aqueous acidic stream, and a third phase; and separating the at least one acidic extracted Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream from the modified aqueous acidic stream and the third phase, wherein after the extraction step the contamination contained in the modified aqueous acidic stream and the third phase is greater than the contamination contained in the extracted Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream.

As disclosed in the present application, a third phase may form during extraction of the Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream with an aqueous acidic stream. The third phase is substantially distinct from the extracted Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream and the modified aqueous acidic stream. Contamination from the Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream may be concentrated into this third phase. (Page 9, Lines 17-27).

As described above, it is respectfully submitted that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Cain and Moore and no reasonable expectation of success in doing so. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that even if there were some suggestion or motivation to combine Cain and Moore and a reasonable expectation of success, Cain and Moore, even when combined, do not disclose or suggest all the claim limitations of independent claim 25 or claims dependent thereon.

It is respectfully submitted that in no way does Cain or Moore disclose or suggest separating at least one acidic extracted Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream from a modified aqueous acidic stream and a third phase, wherein after the extraction step the contamination contained in the modified aqueous acidic stream and the third phase is greater than the contamination contained in the extracted Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream. Applicants note that the Examiner points to stream (28) and stream (22) in Cain, as providing the acidic stream and the third phase. Applicants note, however, as illustrated in

Figure 2 of Cain, the acid extraction is performed in the Extractor (2). A primary oil (4) and a water solution of acetic acid (6) are introduced into the Extractor. From the base of the Extractor there is withdrawn an aqueous extract of water-soluble chemicals, iron salts, and salts of basic nitrogen compounds (8). The washed primary oil (10) emerges from the top of the extractor. Accordingly, in Cain this portion of the process disclosed therein is the acid extraction to remove dissolved or occluded metal contaminants such as iron or iron compounds and there are only two phases and two streams withdrawn.

With regard to stream 22 and stream 28, these streams are withdrawn from a stripping column. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Cain does not disclose or suggest that the combination of primary oil and water solution of acetic acid forms three phases in the Extractor, as presently claimed.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the presently claimed process is significantly different than the process of Cain. Applicants respectfully submit that even if there were some suggestion or motivation to combine Cain and Moore and a reasonable expectation of success, Cain and Moore, even when combined, do not disclose or suggest all the present claim limitations of claim 25 or claims dependent thereon. Applicants respectfully submit that even if combined, Cain in view of Moore does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed method for removing contamination from a Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream. Even if combined, Cain in view of Moore does not disclose or suggest conducting a Fischer-Tropsch process using a catalyst comprising cobalt to produce a Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream; passing the Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream to a treatment zone; passing an aqueous acidic stream to the treatment zone; extracting Al contamination from the Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream by contacting the Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream with the aqueous acidic stream in the treatment zone at extraction conditions to form a mixed stream comprising at least one acidic extracted Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream, a modified aqueous acidic stream, and a third phase; and separating the at least one acidic extracted Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream from the modified aqueous acidic stream and the third phase.

Accordingly, for at least the above described reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejection of claims 25-27, 30, and 31 over Cain in view of Moore be withdrawn.

Claims 19, 20, 22, 28, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Cain in view of Moore and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,476,086 (“Zhou”). Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection; therefore, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Cain relates to the purification of hydrocarbon solutions of oxygenated organic compounds comprising acids and which also may contain dissolved or occluded metal contaminants such as iron or iron compounds. (Col. 1, lines 15-19). Cain discloses that the contaminated hydrocarbon organic chemical mixture can be a product produced by synthesis when carbon monoxide and hydrogen are reacted with a promoted iron catalyst. (Col. 1, Lines 26-36).

Also as described above, Moore is directed to a method for preparing a stabilized mixed fuel from a carbon source at a remote site, and tailoring one or more finished fuel products from the mixed fuel in order to meet local fuel requirements at a market site. Moore is cited as disclosing “that F-T derived streams may be fractionated (i.e., distilled) and hydrotreated.” (Page 6).

Zhou relates to a method for separating iron-based catalyst fines from hydrocarbon liquid/wax/catalyst slurry for Fischer-Tropsch synthesis processes by contacting and/or mixing the slurry with a coalescence enhancing treating solution to facilitate gravity separation and settling of such catalyst, and thereby yield a substantially clean hydrocarbon liquid/wax product. (Abstract). Zhou discloses that the treating solution includes a surface tension reducing agent, an agglutinating agent, and a coalescing agent, each in selected proportions in aqueous solution. (Abstract). Zhou is cited as disclosing filtration techniques used to separate solid contaminants from Fischer Tropsch derived streams.

As described above, Applicants respectfully submit that the presently claimed process is significantly different than the process of Cain. Moreover, as described above, even if there were some suggestion or motivation to combine Cain and Moore, and a reasonable expectation of success, Cain and Moore, even when combined, do not disclose or suggest all the present claim limitations. Zhou is cited merely as disclosing filtration techniques used to separate solid contaminants from Fischer Tropsch derived streams. Accordingly, as cited, Zhou fails to cure the many above-noted deficiencies with respect to Cain and Moore.

Accordingly, for at least the above described reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejection of claims 19, 20, 22, 28, and 29 over Cain in view of Moore and Zhou be withdrawn.

Claims 32 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Cain in view of Moore and Zhou. Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection; therefore, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Cain relates to the purification of hydrocarbon solutions of oxygenated organic compounds comprising acids and which also may contain dissolved or occluded metal contaminants such as iron or iron compounds. (Col. 1, lines 15-19). Cain discloses that the contaminated hydrocarbon organic chemical mixture can be a product produced by synthesis when carbon monoxide and hydrogen are reacted with a promoted iron catalyst. (Col. 1, Lines 26-36).

Also as described above, Moore is directed to a method for preparing a stabilized mixed fuel from a carbon source at a remote site, and tailoring one or more finished fuel products from the mixed fuel in order to meet local fuel requirements at a market site. Moore is cited as disclosing “that F-T derived streams may be fractionated (i.e., distilled) and hydrotreated.” (Page 6).

Zhou relates to a method for separating iron-based catalyst fines from hydrocarbon liquid/wax/catalyst slurry for Fischer-Tropsch synthesis processes by contacting and/or mixing the slurry with a coalescence enhancing treating solution to facilitate gravity separation and settling of such catalyst, and thereby yield a substantially clean hydrocarbon liquid/wax product. (Abstract). Zhou discloses that the treating solution includes a surface tension reducing agent, an agglutinating agent, and a coalescing agent, each in selected proportions in aqueous solution. (Abstract).

In contrast, independent claim 32 recites a method of removing contamination from a Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream. The method comprises passing a syngas to a Fischer-Tropsch reactor to produce a Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream; providing an additive to the contents of the Fischer-Tropsch reactor to precipitate soluble contamination within the reactor; filtering the precipitated contamination from the Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream to produce a filtered hydrocarbon stream; and passing the filtered hydrocarbon stream to a hydroprocessing reactor.

Applicants respectfully submit that even if there were some suggestion or motivation to combine Cain, Moore, and Zhou and a reasonable expectation of success, Cain, Moore, and Zhou even when combined, do not disclose or suggest all the claim limitations of independent claim 32 or claims dependent thereon.

It is respectfully submitted that in no way does Cain, Moore, or Zhou disclose or suggest providing an additive to the contents of the Fischer-Tropsch reactor to precipitate soluble contamination within the reactor. Applicants note that the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have modified the process of Cain by adding the acid to the reactor because the same purification would take place with the added benefit of cost savings due to the reduced equipment requirement. Applicants note, however, that it would not be practical or of added benefit to add a water solution of acetic acid to the Fischer Tropsch reactor. Fischer Tropsch reactions are conducted at temperatures of 300 – 700 °F (149 – 371°C). A water solution would significantly cool the reactor causing the reactor to need to be reheated to reaction temperature to conduct Fischer Tropsch reactions. Furthermore, a water solution would evaporate at the reaction temperatures, and thus, could not be used to extract the product inside the reactor, unless first the reactor was cooled significantly and then heated again to reaction temperature. All of these possibilities for using the water solution in the reactor would not be practical or of added benefit, if possible at all. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Cain does not disclose or suggest adding the acid to the reactor.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the presently claimed process is significantly different than the process of Cain. Applicants respectfully submit that even if there were some suggestion or motivation to combine Cain, Moore, and Zhou and a reasonable expectation of success, Cain, Moore, and Zhou even when combined, do not disclose or suggest all the present claim limitations of claim 32 or claims dependent thereon. Applicants respectfully submit that even if combined, Cain in view of Moore and Zhou does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed method for removing contamination from a Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream. Even if combined, Cain in view of Moore and Zhou does not disclose or suggest passing a syngas to a Fischer-Tropsch reactor to produce a Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream; providing an additive to the contents of the Fischer-Tropsch reactor to precipitate soluble contamination within the reactor; filtering the precipitated contamination from the Fischer-Tropsch derived hydrocarbon stream to produce

a filtered hydrocarbon stream; and passing the filtered hydrocarbon stream to a hydroprocessing reactor.

Accordingly, for at least the above described reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejection of claims 32 and 33 over Cain in view of Moore and Zhou be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For the reasons noted above, the art of record does not disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the claims and allowance of the subject application is earnestly solicited. In the event that there are any questions relating to this application, it would be appreciated if the Examiner would telephone the undersigned attorney concerning such questions so that prosecution of this application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

By: Melissa M. Hayworth
Melissa M. Hayworth
Registration No. 45,774

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: August 2, 2006